REMARKS

1. Summary of the Office Action

In the office action mailed March 21, 2008, claims 1, 11-15, and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. Furthermore, claims 1, 10-11, 13, 16, 21-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0064520 (Takahashi). Additionally, claims 4-9, 12, 14-15, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Takahashi.

2. Status of the Claims

Applicant has amended claims 1, 4-9, 12, 14-16, 18-22, and 24-29. Additionally, Applicant has cancelled claims 10-11 and 13. Thus, currently pending are claims 1, 4-9, 12, 14-16, and 18-29. Of these claims, 1 and 16 are independent, and all others are dependent.

3. Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The office action mailed March 21, 2008 rejected claims 11-15 as lacking proper antecedent basis. Without conceding any assertions made in the office action, Applicant has amended these claims to recite stricter antecedent basis. Furthermore, claims 21-22 were rejected for reciting the term, "substantially." Applicant has amended claims 21-22 to remove the term, "substantially." The office also rejected claims 1 and 11-15 for being incomplete for omitting essential steps. Applicant believes that this rejection was based on the antecedent basis rejection described above. Applicant submits that by amending claims 11-15, this further rejection is rendered moot. In light of these amendments, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable review of these claims.

- 9 -

4.   **Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

As described above, claims 1, 10-11, 13, 16, 21-29 stand rejected as being anticipated by Takahashi. Takahashi relates to a control device (*see, e.g.*, reference numeral 40 in Takahashi, Figures 1, 3, and 6) acting as a dynamic host configuration protocol (DHCP) client to a DHCP server (*see, e.g.*, reference numeral 20 in Takahashi, Figures 1, 3, and 6). The control device has two modes of DHCP operation. In both modes, the control device, upon initiation, acquires an IP address from the DHCP server. *See, e.g.*, Takahashi, ¶¶ 0033 and 0041. In the first mode, prior to halting operation, the control device notifies the DHCP server that it (the control device) is terminating use of the IP address. *See, e.g.*, Takahashi, ¶ 0035. In the second mode, the control device does not notify the DHCP server that it (the control device) is terminating use of the IP address prior to halting operation. *See, e.g.*, Takahashi, ¶ 0041. Instead, the control device halts, and then, after recovering from the halt state, the control device determines if its IP address lease from the DHCP server has expired. *See, e.g.*, Takahashi, ¶¶ 0041 and 0042. This determination is based on the period of time that has passed between the initial, pre-halt allocation of the IP address and the time at which the control device recovers from the halt. *See, e.g.*, Takahashi, ¶ 0042. If the control device determines that its IP address lease has not expired, the control device continues using the IP address without explicitly informing the DHCP server. *See, e.g.*, Takahashi, ¶¶ 0042 and 0043.

In contrast to Takahashi, independent claim 1 recites a wireless node being assigned Internet Protocol session parameters from a wireless access gateway for a first Internet Protocol session. Upon conclusion of the first Internet Protocol session, the wireless access gateway responsively maintains the Internet Protocol session parameters assigned to the wireless node for a pre-defined period of time that begins upon the conclusion of the first Internet Protocol session.

If the wireless node initiates a second Internet Protocol session within this pre-defined period of time from the conclusion of the first Internet Protocol session, the wireless access gateway re-assigns the same Internet Protocol session parameters to the wireless node.

Takahashi teaches and claim 1 recites a period of time during which Internet Protocol session parameters (e.g., an IP address) are reserved for a client device. However, Takahashi teaches two modes of operation as distinct embodiments, neither of which teach each and every element of claim 1.

In Takahashi's first mode of operation, the client device explicitly releases its IP address to the DHCP server at the conclusion of a first Internet Protocol session. The client device later initiates a second Internet Protocol session and requests the same IP address from the DHCP server. However, the DHCP server does not reserve the IP address for the client device between the two Internet Protocol sessions. Thus, the DHCP server may not be able to assign the same IP address to the client device for the second Internet Protocol session, and therefore, Takahashi's first mode of operation does not maintain the Internet Protocol session parameters used in the first Internet Protocol session so that they can be used in the second Internet Protocol session. *See, e.g.*, Takahashi, ¶ 0036.

In contrast to Takahashi's first mode of operation, claim 1 recites that the wireless access gateway, responsive to detecting the conclusion of the first Internet Protocol session, maintains for a pre-defined period of time the Internet Protocol session parameter(s), wherein the pre-defined period of time begins upon the conclusion of the first Internet protocol session. Furthermore, claim 1 also recites the wireless access gateway detecting a wireless node (e.g., a client device) initiating a second Internet Protocol session within the pre-defined period of time, assigning the Internet Protocol session parameter(s) as corresponds to the wireless node and as

- 11 -

was recently previously assigned to the wireless node. Thus, unlike Takahashi, claim 1 recites *maintaining* (reserving) Internet Protocol session parameter(s) beyond the conclusion of an Internet Protocol session.

In Takahashi's second mode of operation, the client device does not release its IP address to the DHCP server at the conclusion of a first Internet Protocol session. The client device instead concludes the first Internet Protocol session, and then, at some later time, initiates a second Internet Protocol session. Upon this initiation, the client device determines whether or not it can maintain the same IP address that it used for the first Internet Protocol session. If the client device determines that it can, the client device begins to use this IP address once more, without notifying the DHCP server that it is doing so. *See*, *e.g.*, Takahashi, ¶¶ 0041-0044.

In contrast to Takahashi's second mode of operation, claim 1 recites that the wireless access gateway (analogous to the DHCP server of Takahashi) *detects* the conclusion of the first Internet Protocol session. Furthermore, claim 1 also recites that the wireless access gateway *detects* the wireless node initiating a second Internet Protocol session within the pre-defined period of time after the conclusion of the first Internet Protocol session. Neither of these elements of claim 1 are taught by Takahashi's second mode of operation.

Thus, neither Takahashi's first or second mode of operation teach the elements of detecting the conclusion of a first Internet Protocol session and responsively maintaining, for a pre-defined period of time, the Internet Protocol session parameter(s) associated with the first Internet Protocol session for later use by the client device. Thus, Takahashi does not anticipate claim 1.

Independent claim 16 recites a method substantially similar to claim 1 with respect to the discussion above. Applicant submits that both independent claims 1 and 16 are not anticipated by Takahashi for at least the reasons presented in this discussion.

Additionally, Applicant submits that Takahashi does not anticipate any of the dependent claims, as these claims depend, directly or indirectly, from an allowable independent claim. However, with respect to claims 22-29, the office action cites to paragraphs 0030 and 0040-0043 of Takahashi as the basis of the associated rejections. Applicant asserts that, regardless of the allowability of the independent claims, Takahashi does not anticipate claims 22-29.

Claims 22-29, recite, for example, where the aforementioned period of time between a first and a second Internet Protocol session is chosen from a range of candidate periods of time or is dynamically determined based on the current time of day, day, or the availability of Internet Protocol session resources. Takahashi, however, does not teach the matter of these claims, and, in particular, fails to disclose varying its predetermined time period (i.e., its DHCP lease duration).

Thus, even though claims 22-29 are allowable because they depend from an allowable claim, Applicant submits that these claims are also allowable because Takahashi does not anticipate the elements recited therein.

5.   **Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

As described above, claims 4-9, 12, 14-15, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Takahashi. Applicant submits that these claims are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable claims 1 or 16.

6. Conclusion

Without conceding any assertions made in the office action that were not addressed herein, Applicant submits that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with the undersigned, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-3361.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Dated: July 15, 2008

By: /Michael S. Borella/_____
Michael S. Borella
Reg. No. 62,361